Women's Work and Wages in the Soviet Union. by Alastair McAuley
Review by: Janet G. Chapman
*Slavic Review*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Summer, 1983), pp. 304-305
Published by:
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2497548
Accessed: 16/06/2014 05:44

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Slavic Review*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 185.2.32.121 on Mon, 16 Jun 2014 05:44:00 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

studies to shape the development of comparative economics and welfare economics, two fields which were in their infancy when his work first appeared in the 1940s.

The volume under review here is a collection of original articles written by students and colleagues of Abram Bergson and dedicated to him. It is a fitting Festschrift. The essays are of high quality and exhibit the traits and the range of interests which Bergson has demonstrated in the course of his career. In a thought-provoking preface, Steven Rosefielde discusses the key issues Bergson identified that underlie the analysis of the Soviet economy. The rest of the volume is divided into two sections. The first section, comprising the bulk of the book, consists primarily of analyses of the Soviet economy. The focus is diverse, covering contemporary and historical issues, microeconomic as well as macroeconomic concerns, and domestic as well as international economic performance. In more specific terms, there are two excellent articles by Joseph Berliner and David Granick on the evolution of Soviet pricing policy and its constraints; two thoughtful and topical articles by Franklyn Holtzman and Steven Rosefielde dealing with external trade and the issues of comparative advantage and the calculation of credit worthiness; an intriguing theoretical analysis by John Michael Montias and Susan Rose-Ackerman of corruption as a function of the incentive structure of the Soviet economy; a unique and very high quality study by Gur Ofer and Aaron Vinokur of male/female income differentials based on survey data collected in Israel; and a stimulating reassessment by Paul Gregory of the economic performance of Russia in the twenty years preceding the Revolution. There is much here for specialists in Soviet area studies — for political scientists, sociologists, and historians as well as for economists.

The second section is also diverse, focusing on all those concerns that are part of the field of welfare economics. It features papers by some of the dominant thinkers in welfare and macroeconomics. Jan Tinbergin analyzes the optimal distribution of income, education, and occupation, applied to the Netherlands; Martin Spechler discusses the limits to product quality in planned and market systems; Simon Kuznets deals with the impact of aggregate growth on productivity across sectors; Kenneth Arrow renders an assessment of optimal and voluntary income distribution; and Paul Samuelson offers an engaging review of Bergson's contributions to welfare economics. This section is of primary interest to scholars concerned with the theoretical terrain demarcated by welfare economics.

This Festschrift is a stimulating book in its own right, featuring, particularly in the first section, new data and new issues as well as original and rigorous interpretations of "old" data and old issues. It also provides ample testimony to the contribution Abram Bergson has made to Soviet studies and to comparative, welfare, and international economics.

VALERIE BUNCE
*Northwestern University*

WOMEN'S WORK AND WAGES IN THE SOVIET UNION. By *Alastair McAuley*. London and Winchester, Mass.: George Allen & Unwin, 1981. xi, 228 pp. Figures. Tables. $28.50.

This is a detailed and sophisticated study of the position of women in the Soviet labor force. McAuley's primary focus is on the extent to which the Soviet goal of sexual equality in employment has been met. The goal includes full employment and equal access to education, which have been accomplished. Yet women's earnings, limited information suggests, average only 60 to 65 percent of men's. Occupational segregation, which he analyzes in detail, is the major explanation. He finds that it has increased over the period studied (mainly 1939–1970), particularly in agriculture and in nonagricultural manual work. Women have made substantial gains in white-collar jobs, including the

This content downloaded from 185.2.32.121 on Mon, 16 Jun 2014 05:44:00 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

professions, but even here occupational segregation has increased. Reasons for segregation and the lower earnings of women are then sought in Soviet views of the sources of inequality, the role of education, the impact of protective legislation and social services for women, and working women as mothers.

The Soviet constitution (1936 and 1977), which guarantees women equal rights with men in work, pay, and education, also makes provisions intended to facilitate combining work and motherhood. These include preschool child care, paid maternity leave, and state protection of the interests of mother and child. Protective legislation, as American feminists are well aware, may backfire. Most emphasized by McAuley is the legislation prohibiting women from work considered detrimental to their health. This legislation has not always been enforced and many women perform heavy manual labor, but it has effectively excluded girls from many schools that provide training for the skilled and better paid manual jobs.

Soviet scholars, politicians, and Soviet women themselves seem generally to accept distinctions between "women's" work and "men's" work and believe in special treatment for women. McAuley points to recent increased emphasis on the maternal role of women, arising from the declining birthrate and increasing infant mortality. The pronatalist measures he reports as having been under discussion have since been adopted and are being implemented.

McAuley's findings on the nature of the constraints on women's choice of jobs, many relating to the double burden of employment and family obligations, and the consequences for their earning power are similar to those of other Western studies. But unlike these studies, he concludes that the failure to achieve equality is explained less by a failure to devote sufficient resources to the goal of equality than by a deficiency in Soviet theory. What it comes down to is that the nuclear family, as it has been fostered in the USSR, is incompatible with full and equal participation of women in the labor force. According to Marxian theory, under capitalism the nuclear family is required to handle property, whereas it may not be needed under socialism. McAuley suggests that the implications have not been thought through by Soviet theorists, and that they should consider alternative ways of rearing children and organizing consumption.

On the whole, McAuley handles serious data problems with skill. Where the data are reasonably reliable, he constructs useful summary measures (though I would prefer to see the original data as well). When faced with scattered sample survey data, he is careful to warn the reader of the limitations, yet he occasionally extracts more from such data than appears to be justified.

The study provides some new measures, additional rich detail, and perceptive insights into women's work in the USSR. McAuley briefly relates his work to the studies of Norton Dodge, Gail Lapidus, and Hilda Scott and lists a number of other Western studies in the bibliography. Beyond this he makes little reference to related Western studies. For instance, there is no mention of the differences between McAuley's and Michael Paul Sacks's measures of segregation based on the same census materials. Thus, the cumulative effect of additional research on the question is less than it might have been.

JANET G. CHAPMAN
*University of Pittsburgh*

This content downloaded from 185.2.32.121 on Mon, 16 Jun 2014 05:44:00 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions